

KEYNOTE SPEECH

ON SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PUBLIC ORGANISATION

KOREA UNIVERSITY, 11 May 2012

Contingency Theory or Universal Theory on Public Organisation?

Achmad Nurmandi

Goodness which is not organized was defeated by organized crime (ali ibn abi tholib , friend of the prophet muhammad)

The honorable Rector, Dean, Head of Department of Korea University who provide and to place this important conference . The honorable representative of supporting universities, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Mindanao State University Philipines and Universitas Ngurahrai, Bali Indonesia

In this speech I would like to bring up a few matters related to the public organisation. Public organizations have a central role to achieve the greater benefit of mankind, without good organization will not be realized. Therefore ICONPO is one of the important orum for research publication and inform best practices around the world.

Trend of Public Organisation Theory

Some researchers concern to applicability of management and organisation theories and practices has historically been a major concern of scholars dealing with developing country situations (Hoskisson et al. 2000, Hofstede, 1993, Jaeger, 1990). Researchers have been debating this issue from divergence, universality, convergence, and situational perspectives. According to the divergence, mostly comparative management literature western management theories stop at the cultural border of each nation. According to this view culture is indeed the main source of management differences between developed and developing countries (Hofstede 1980).

In contrast, Simon and Mintzberg those with universal view (Simon 1997) argue that culture does not limit the applicability of management theories and believe that there are similar management practices within organizations all around the world. Those with

convergence perspective consider the degree of industrialization as the main determinant for applicability of management theories (Lauter 1969). According to convergence view western management theories may not be applicable in developing countries as a result of the technical and economic difficulties in these countries rather than cultural constraints. Situational or contingency theorists, as opposed to universalists, consider different situational factors such as manager's personality, firms' ownership and sector (i.e. private or public), and their hierarchy as the main determinants for the applicability of management theories.

What future developments can be expected for public organizations around the world? The last twenty-five years' experience with administrative reforms provides the basis for three different scenarios. Christensen et al (2007) concluded that three scenarios of future development of public organisation. Firstly, the conception of a *linear development* towards more management, efficiency and market-orientation. We may have witnessed merely the beginning of the NPM movement, so that a possible future development might be continuous, increasing dominance of the new administrative dogma. In a world of increasing globalization and internationalization there may be no alternatives to NPM reforms. They will exert pressure, appear essential and lead to increasing similarity and convergence between public and private organizations and between public sectors in different countries. Market-oriented solutions will function as mechanisms for selection, and organizational reforms not in compliance with them will be rejected or resisted. Economically oriented reforms will enjoy ideological hegemony or be perceived as the most functional solutions; hence they will be necessary instruments for counteracting telltale signs of 'sickness' in the public sector and may ensure survival in an increasingly competitive situation (Christensen, 2007).

A second scenario is that after a period of NPM reforms and one-sided emphasis on one particular value, a *reaction* will come and public organizations will redeploy certain key aspects of good old-fashioned administrative principles (Christensen, 2007). A third possible line of development questions the notions of straight-line development or swings of the pendulum and asks whether a *dialectical development* can happen. Are the public sectors in modern welfare states at a historical watershed, where old-style public administration meets NPM and amalgamates into a new synthesis, different from both the NPM ideal and

traditional organizational forms? Are public organizations changing in new, more complex and complicated ways? (Chrintensen, et al, 2009).

The Growth of Scientific Knowledge

The development of scientific knowledge according to Popper like humans who solve the problem, yang mencakup six (6) phases. When referring to the process of development of a science of Poppers are the social theory is not confirmed but it is falsifiable. The extent to which a theory in Administrative Sciences tested. Weber's theory of bureaucracy, for example a rational will deal with problem of developing countries. The discrepancy between the theory of ideal Weber's bureaucracy with cultural and political environment in developing countries when we refer to the Popper developing countries to apply the theories of Western social science was not successful, due to the difference in social political environments. Feyerabend criticized Western social sciences as a new form of dogmatism, elitist and overintellectuals (Minger, 1997: 301). Fred w. Rigg and Eaton then develop society theory that sees the role of prismatic bureaucracy in the developing countries . The development of social science is certainly very different from natural sciences in accordance with its object. Researchers examined the subject might not object can be released with the object. Habermas criticized empirical cycle has been meredusir of human potential, and is inherently afflicted in his research activities (Minger, 1997: 297). Therefore, the development of social science must encourage the development of social theories that are new and come from the community concerned. While Kuhn is seeing the development cycle of knowledge Ilmu, histories through the four phases i.e. pre-paradigm, paradigm, crisis and revolution. Kuhn is seeing the history of science of historical context and not on rational thought as outlined by Popper.

Organizations like the blind who sees elephants, each of which develops its own perspective according to the subjective construction of object named Organization (Hatch, 1997: 8). The complexity of the source to the emergence of various organizations yang menjadi perspektif. In the four existing box called classic, modern, simbolik-interpretive and post-modern. Each box mewakili

different perspectives of organizational theory. Mary Jo Hatch says that theory development is sequence process, meaning that preceded the modern classic box. In modern theories, organizations are seen as physical reality, very different symbolic and interpretive denganperspektif-post-modern rneihatnya sebagaiorganisasi as a subjective phenomenon. Although, theory was an accumulation of theories in histories and affecting each other.

In modern theories, organizations are seen as physical reality, which is very different from a symbolic perspective-interpretive and post-modern sebagaiorganisasi who sees it as a subjective phenomenon. Although the dernikian, not the berartiperspektif after replacing the previous perspective. In theory, there was an accumulation of theories in histories and mernpengaruhi one-another and mutually strengthen (Hatch, 1997: 4), thus experiencing the development of continuously or continually. Philosophical aspects of ilmupengetahuan (epistimologi), the development of the theories of organisasidapat seen in crystal clear waters. Epistirnologi learn how science organization retrieved and created. The Organization science evolved from the difference between objectivism and subjectivism. Epistimologi world view objectivism as something separated from the subject, as embraced by the positivism. Meanwhile saw knowledge as a flow of subjectivism something relative and can only be didptakan where a researcher observes. Whereas the third stream called deonstrucrism see the knowledge created through the process of social and cultural (Hatch, 1997: 49).

Refferences

Chalmers, A.F. *What is This Thing Called Science?*, (London: The Open University Press, 1982).

Christense, Tom, et al, *Organization Theory and the Public Sector*, (London: Routhledge, 2007).

Hatch, Mar., Jo. *Organization Theory*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Marshall, Catherine, and GretchenB. Rossman. *DesigningQualitative Research*.(London:Sage Publication, 1982).

Mayer, Robert R. dan Ernest Greenwood, *Social Research Design*, (**Jakarta:** Rajawali, 1984).

Mingers, John and Anthony Gill, *Multimethodology*.(**Chichester:**John Wiley, 1997).